

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 12, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b); and claims 4-6, 8, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The cancellation of claims 8 and 13 renders the rejection of those claims moot. The rejection of claims 1-7, 9-12, 14, and 15 is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

### *Claim Amendments*

The foregoing amendment of method claim 1 (and similarly of independent system claim 15) proposes:

- providing on each one of a plurality of production database servers a live version of at least one business data table containing information used to populate web pages on a plurality of production web servers (*see*, e.g., Specification, p. 8, line 31-p. 9, line 4; p. 14, lines 19-21; p. 21, lines 24-25);
- allowing a maker at a business workstation to access the quality assurance database server and enter a change to data on the quality assurance version of the at least one business data table and a designation of a time for the change to be replicated from the quality assurance database server to the live version of the at least one business data table on each of the plurality of production database servers (*see*, e.g., Specification, p. 8, lines 3-7; p. 9, lines 29-32; p. 14, lines 19-21; p. 19, lines 18-24; p. 22, lines 1-2);
- simultaneously replicating the change to the data on the quality assurance version of the at least one business data table at the designated time from the quality assurance database server to the live version of the at least one business data table on each of the plurality of the production database servers (*see*, e.g., Specification, p. 6, lines 22-24; p. 7, lines 22-24; p. 9, lines 29-32; p. 14, lines 19-21; p. 22, lines 1-2).

In addition, claims 8 and 13 are canceled and claim 2 is amended to address editorial issues raised by the amendment of claim 1. Support for the foregoing amendment is found throughout the specification and in the claims as noted above, and no new matter is added.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102*

Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 12, and 14-15 stand rejected as anticipated by Skok (2002/00911725) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 15, Skok fails to teach or suggest one or more limitations recited in claims 15 in at least the following respects:

- According to Skok, a user at a pc with a browser edits a local copy of a web page presented by a web server which thereafter queues the edited page for approval, and if approved, updates the web page with the changes (*see*, e.g., Skok, pars. [0065]-[0066]).
- There is no hint of teaching or suggestion in Skok of entering a designation of a time for the change to be replicated from the quality assurance database server to the live version of the at least one business data table on each of the plurality of production database servers, as recited in amended claims 1 and similarly in amended claim 15.
- Nor is there any teaching or suggestion whatsoever in Skok of simultaneously replicating the change...at the designated time from the quality assurance database server to the live version...on each of the plurality of the production database servers, as likewise recited in amended claims 1 and similarly in amended claim 15.

Consequently, Skok fails to teach the required combinations of limitations recited in amended claims 1 and 15 respectively. Because each and every element as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 15 is not found, either expressly or inherently in the cited reference, the Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability. See Verdegaaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987); See also MPEP §2131. The Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability for amended independent claims 1 and 15 and similarly has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, and 14 that depend on claim 1 and which recite further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence with the reference.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 4-6 and 10 stand rejected as obvious over Skok in view of Ries (2003/0023632) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); claims 8 and 13 stand rejected as obvious over Skok in view of Sutherland (2002/0120757) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); and claim 11 stands rejected as obvious

over Skok in view of Cochran (2004/0030697) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); . The cancellation of claims 8 and 13 renders the rejection of those claims moot. The rejection of claims 4-6, 10, and 11 is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claims 4-6 and 10 depending on claim 1, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 15, Skok fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability with respect to amended claim 1 because Skok does not teach the required combinations of limitations recited in amended claim 1. Additionally, since claims 4-6 and 10 are dependent on allowable claim 1, and since Ries, which is alleged by the Examiner merely to disclose SQL database and backend database management, fails to remedy the deficiencies of Skok, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for claims 4-6 and 10 that depend on claim 1 and which recite further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence to the references.

With respect to claims 8 and 13 depending on claim 1, as noted above, the cancellation of claims 8 and 13 renders their rejection moot. Further, with respect to amended claim 1, for at least the reasons set forth above, Skok fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability with respect to amended claim 1 because Skok does not teach the required combinations of limitations recited in amended claim 1, and Sutherland which discloses nothing more than URLs that self-expire to prevent users from leaving a website and then logging back on later (*see, e.g.,* Sutherland, par. 0074), fails to remedy the deficiencies of Skok.

Regarding claim 11 depending on claim 1, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 15, Skok fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability with respect to amended claim 1 because Skok does not teach the required combinations of limitations recited in amended claim 1 on which claim 11 depends. Additionally, since claim 11 is dependent on allowable claim 1, and since Cochran which simply discloses use of a browser at a workstation to access stored data (*see, e.g.,* Cochran, Abstract), fails to remedy the deficiencies of Skok, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for claim 11 that depends on claim 1 and which recites further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence to the references.

Consequently, Skok, Ries, Sutherland and/or Cochran, separately or in combination with one another, do not recite the required combinations of limitations of claims 4-6, 10, and 11. Because each and every element as set forth in claims 4-6, 10, and 11 is not found, either expressly or inherently, in Skok, Ries, Sutherland and/or Cochran, the Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability. See In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A., 1974) (holding that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires the references to teach all of the limitations of the rejected claim); See also MPEP §2143.03.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendment and these remarks, each of the claims remaining in the application is in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection and to pass the application to issue. The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at (704) 503-2579 to discuss any questions relating to the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 4, 2009

/s/ John M. Harrington - Reg. #25,592 /  
John M. Harrington (Reg. No. 25,592)

King & Spalding LLP  
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-4706  
(202) 737-0500